



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Displacement of John xiv.

BENJAMIN WISNER BACON, D.D.

OSWEGO, N.Y.

THERE can scarcely be an attentive reader of the Gospel of John who has not been struck by the strange position occupied by the clause, "Arise, let us go hence," at the end of ch. xiv. ; for instead of marking the conclusion of the discourse and the setting out on the walk from the scene of the supper to Gethsemane, as we should expect, it marks no change of action or scene whatever. The address continues for two long chapters, followed by the farewell prayer (ch. xvii.), and not until ch. xviii. do we meet the statement we look for: "When Jesus had spoken these words, he went forth with his disciples over the brook Kedron, where was a garden, into the which he entered, himself and his disciples."

Passing over various theories intended to account for this singular phenomenon, all more or less unsatisfactory, we may summarize opinion as follows:—

a) The traditional view. This assumes that the words are inserted here because the author of the Gospel remembered that in the course of this final address to the Twelve Jesus had proposed to leave the place, but, a new thought occurring to his mind, gave up, for the time being, the thought of removal, continued his parting instructions, and did not actually go forth until after the prayer (ch. xvii.).

b) Theories of various critics, differing in theological standpoint all the way from H. H. Wendt to O. Pfleiderer, who regard the clause as the insertion of an editor, or the author, on the basis of Mk. xiv. 42. Pfleiderer, *e.g.*, suggests that possibly the author here laid down his pen, not expecting to say more of the discourses of the upper room ; but that subsequently determining to add the material of chaps. xv.—xvii., he omitted, on resuming, to strike out this concluding clause, or to remove it to the beginning of ch. xviii. Wendt supposes that the editor failed to appreciate the elliptical (?) construc-

tion of xiv. 31 (cf. xv. 25), and added this clause from Mk. xiv. 42 to complete it.

The fatal objection to the traditional view is, that it assumes a change of mind on Jesus' part, which, even if we could regard such a preservation of the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus as consonant with the character of the Fourth Gospel, would be historically and psychologically inconceivable under the circumstances of the fatal night. The circumstances, as outlined by all four of the evangelists, are substantially as follows:—

In the house of a friend (let us suppose Mary, the mother of John Mark; cf. Acts i. 13, xii. 12) in the city, Jesus, on account of the plots of his enemies, had secured by prearrangement¹ a place to keep the Passover-feast with the Twelve. Not trusting even all of these with the knowledge of the place of rendezvous, he had sent Peter and John on this day to meet a man in the city, to be known by special sign, who would guide them to the house where they should make ready (Mk. xiv. 12-16). Judas, the traitor, was thus in ignorance where to direct his posse, until the Twelve were actually together at the house; nor was he able to find an excuse to depart on his despicable errand until toward the end of the meal itself (John xiii. 21-31 and parallels). But almost immediately upon the withdrawal of Judas, it would be obvious to Jesus that it was unsafe to remain longer at the house. To suppose that he courted the violence of the hired bravos and kidnappers of Annas and Caiaphas, is utterly to misconceive the mood which prompted him to suggest the precaution of the swords (Lk. xxii. 38), as well as the prearrangements above noted, and wholly to misread the agonized prayer of Gethsemane. To the very last Jesus was seeking, "if it were possible," to escape the illegal violence, secret assassination or mob-law procurable by his enemies; and if he had not sought it for himself, certainly he would have for the eleven. He must therefore have retired well in advance of the traitor's return out of the city to the garden of Gethsemane, and cannot have changed his mind merely to prolong the conversation.

If there be, in fact, any connection between the "Arise, let us go hence" of John and the similar saying of Mk. xiv. 42, we can assign no other motive than that assigned by Mark, "Behold, he that betrayeth me is at hand." It was not long till Judas and his posse arrived

¹ "Large upper rooms" furnished were not otherwise obtainable in Jerusalem at the Passover season.

at the house where he had left the Twelve, and found its inmates already retired for the night. The bird was flown, but their descent upon the house gave a further alarm. A "young man" (Mark, the son of the house?), realizing the danger Jesus was in, sprang from his bed, and stopping not even to dress, but wrapping only the "linen sheet about his naked body," ran in advance of the posse toward the mount of Olives, to warn the victim of his danger. He arrived just too late to help, escaping himself only by a hair's breadth (Mk. xiv. 51 f.).

If such be substantially the story, how is it conceivable — how can we harmonize it with any possible condition of the Saviour's mind — that some time after Judas had gone out he brought his discourse with his disciples to a conclusion with the words: "Arise, let us go hence," but, upon a new thought entering his mind, or for some unassignable reason, gave up his idea of going, and continued at much greater length than before? If Jesus could calmly continue after this warning of imminent danger and proposal of flight, what of the disciples, who have just been told of the betrayal?

The supposition that we have here to do with an author relating his recollections with extraordinary accuracy of detail is thus incredible. But if not a fact preserved by memory, why does the strange clause here interrupt the context? Be it author, compiler, or editor, who for one reason or another inserts at this point his parallel to Mk. xiv. 42, there *was* a reason, and that reason it is our business to find, unless indeed we appeal to accident or fancy, — a tacit acknowledgment of inability to account for the facts.

Our answer is, that a break of this kind, so obvious and at the same time so purposeless, is not the work of a single author, nor can it be even that of an editor or compiler, except by oversight or accident. As the text now stands, the impression is irresistible that chaps. xv., xvi. are uttered on the way to Gethsemane. Except for the prayer (ch. xvii.), which cannot, of course, have been uttered in the street, this impression would persist until xviii. 1. Even a careful editor should have put before xv. 1: "Jesus nevertheless continued and said," etc. In short, the indications point to what a geologist might call a "fault" in the literary strata, and, as the critic well knows, it is these "faults" which reveal the literary history of a document.

In this case, for reasons to be hereafter noted, our solution must approximate much more nearly to Wendt's theory of editorial manipulation of Johannine, or quasi-Johannine, material, producing serious

dislocations here and there throughout the Gospel, than to that which, either from the pro- or anti-Johannine standpoint, insists upon the absolute unity of the Gospel. "Accident," whether in the form suggested by Pfeiderer, or as part of the history of the text, is not a solution with which we can rest satisfied, especially when the kindred phenomena throughout the Gospel are considered.

Let us then first state and support our theory of the present "fault," and afterward compare the rest. Our explanation is as follows: The fourteenth chapter of John was originally, as its contents unavoidably impress us, the very last farewell address of Jesus to his disciples, fittingly concluding with the clause, "Arise, let us go hence," which introduced the sublime, "high-priestly" prayer of ch. xvii., uttered while all were standing (the usual attitude of prayer; Lk. xviii. 11, 13; Mt. vi. 5) ready to go forth (xviii. 1). Chapters xv., xvi. are inserted too late, interrupting the connection, and should follow upon xiii. 20.

Let our demonstration begin with that which may be supposed matter of common observation, viz.: that ch. xiv. is preëminently a last farewell, which more and more approaches the climax as it continues, until in vv. 25-31 the actual "farewell" (*shalom* = "peace," "good-by") is spoken and reiterated with loving insistence. Who can read this indescribably tender parting benediction: "Peace I leave with you; my peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid" — and not feel that this is the end?² What more appropriate connection can be conceived after this: ". . . as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do. Arise, let us go hence", than just what follows if we pass to the beginning of ch. xvii.: "These things spake Jesus; and lifting up his eyes to heaven, he said, Father, the hour is come . . ." ? Who will not admit that this is better than to proceed, as the text now is, utterly without connection: "I am the true vine," etc.

But take a few individual passages, which seem specifically and positively to require this transposition.

In xiv. 1-6 we have a full and explicit reply to the question of Simon Peter in xiii. 36, — this verse, with context, being, therefore, of course, inseparable from ch. xiv., — "Lord, whither goest thou?" This question in turn is based upon xiii. 33, and is further supple-

² Luther's comment is: "These are last words, as of one who is about to go away, and says good-night, or gives his blessing."

mented by that of Thomas in xiv. 5. The rest of the chapter is occupied with the comfort and reassurance of the eleven for their personal deprivation in the removal of the Master's visible presence. Jesus promises his spiritual self-manifestation to the disciples "and not unto the world" (vs. 22 ; cf. xvii. 9), a spiritual parousia. The question, then, "whither goest thou?" has not only been put already in these very words, but it has been answered doubly, triply, and the answer explained at length ; the disciples have raised their objections and these have been met ; and even the distress and fear consequent upon their full understanding of Jesus' meaning have been hushed and comforted. How is it compatible with this, that in xvi. 5 we read : "But now I go unto him that sent me ; *and none of you asketh me, Whither goest thou ?*" Can this come *after* xiii. 36? The supporter of the traditional order will say (Weiss) : The sense of xvi. 5 is, "None of you *any longer* asketh me, Whither goest thou ; because now you understand." But this interpretation is made impossible by vv. 16-29, in which the apostles are at first utterly perplexed to know what Jesus means : "What is this that he saith unto us, A little while and ye behold me not, and again a little while and ye shall see me : and, Because I go to the Father? . . . we know not what he saith." It is clear that the sorrow of vs. 6 is that not of clear knowledge, but only of vague apprehension on the disciples' part. Jesus now awakens them gradually to the truth. He first breaks it to them in the "parable" of the woman in travail, vv. 20-22, and finally, after vv. 25-28, they acknowledge : "Now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no parable." But the conclusive reason why we cannot permit ourselves to insert an unexpressed "any longer," is that if the author had meant this he would have said it. He would have written : "None of you *remembereth* that I said," etc., instead of suggesting that they might now ask again (?) a question already asked and answered. No, the asking and answering of the question, "Whither," is to follow after xvi. 5 ; it cannot precede it.

But note the progress of thought in xvi. 5-33. In vs. 5 the transition is made from the general persecution of the world to the personal loss the disciples are to experience. The climax is reached in vs. 32 : "Behold, the hour cometh, yea, is come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone : and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me." Now it is not an accident that the Synoptics place Peter's passionate protestation of loyalty immediately after this mournful prediction of Jesus, expressed

by them in substantially the same terms. The relation is that of cause and effect. But where, in John, do we find Peter's protest and Jesus' reply? In xiii. 36-38, where only the proposed transposition will reestablish between it and the prediction of Jesus in xvi. 32 this true relation of cause and effect; cf. John xvi. 31-33, xiii. 31^b-38 with Mt. xxvi. 31-35.

Thus the whole progress of thought in John xvi. is a gradual unfolding to the disciples of the real nature of the impending calamity Jesus has in mind in speaking of his "going away." Which now is the necessary historical order: *first* a perfectly clear and full discussion of the "whither" of Jesus' going, and a soothing, stilling and comforting of all the sorrow and bereavement implied; *afterwards* a gradual unfolding of the nature of the calamity meant and rousing of the sorrowing and lamenting (xvi. 6, 20, 32) till it reaches the highest pitch? Or must not this order be necessarily reversed, and sorrow come *first* and *afterward* comfort, even if we say nothing of the necessity of the disciples' first understanding the full nature of their "bereavement" (xiv. 18) before they can be comforted for it?

I pass over minor difficulties due to the order of the present text, such as xvi. 17 f., after clear declarations like xiii. 33; xiv. 18, 28, etc., and proceed to a scrutiny of the section thus far neglected, the parable of "the true vine," with its elaboration.

The incongruity of the new subject in xv. 1 ff., after the solemn last farewell of xiv. 25-31, has been noted. The benediction should not be interrupted to make room for a point omitted in the sermon. However superior to rules of connection the Fourth Evangelist may be in a single instance here and there, he cannot be supposed to have designedly so arranged his material that the *series* of references in xiv. should connect with xvii., while the *series* of xv., xvi. should *all* refer to ch. xiii.

Let us then examine the structure and significance of the parable of the vine. What preceding context, if any, does it imply? In its very opening words we are called upon to supply an implied connection. It is not an accident that instead of "I am the vine," or "I am a vine," as we should expect if the parable stood by itself, we have, "I am *the true* vine (ἡ ἀμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή), and my Father is the husbandman." It is by way of contrast with something else wont to be regarded as the vine of God, that Jesus declares that he and his disciples in their common life, abiding together in a true and constant *unio mystica*, are the *real* vine which Jehovah nourishes to bear

him fruit in due season. We need only glance at Ps. lxxx., and the various passages in the Old and New Testament where this favorite symbol is employed (Is. v. 1-7, Mt. xxi. 33-43, etc.), to see what is the contrast intended. That which is commonly assumed to be the vine of God, which, as a "husbandman," Jehovah brought forth out of Egypt, planted and nourished that it might bear him fruit, is the Israel according to the flesh, the seed of Abraham. The *true* vine of God, which will really bear him fruit, is the church of Christ, the Israel of God according to the spirit, the seed of Abraham by faith. In mystic solidarity with their Head they will live and grow and bear much fruit to the glory of the Father (vv. 1-8). But the condition of this unity and growth is the new commandment of ministering love, which Jesus has himself supremely exemplified. This alone must be the "bond of perfectness" (vv. 9-17).

Now, if any allusion exists in the connection of these chapters to "the vine which Jehovah brought out of Egypt," as ἡ ἀληθινή in xv. 1 seems to imply, the place to look for it is in the connection of the Passover meal, which commemorated this very event, more especially the ritual of "the cup after supper," which we must suppose to have been followed, even if with some we regard this last supper of the Fourth Gospel as only a substitute for the true Passover of the 14th of Nisan. This is surely a better explanation of ἡ ἀληθινή than to fall to imagining wholly fortuitous occurrences in ch. xiv., such as "catching a glimpse of vineyards" (at night?), or "tendrils of a vine creeping in at the window."

But how much closer and more apparent does the connection with ch. xiii. become, when we proceed to the application of the parable. The "bond of perfectness" in this *unio mystica* of the church, typified by the true vine of God, is to be mutual, self-abnegating, ministering love; and we are not left merely to *infer* the connection with that supreme act of divine condescension, the washing of the disciples' feet, which occupies the first 17 verses of ch. xiii., but ch. xiii. first, as though looking forward to ch. xv., introduces it as a kind of sacrament of union consolidating the body of true disciples (vs. 8), explaining it as intended for a practical illustration of the rule: "He that is greatest let him be servant of all"; then ch. xv. on its part refers back to it with its "Love one another even as I have loved you." The progress of thought from xiii. 1-20 through xv. 1-17, if we leave out ch. xiv. and what appertains to it, is perfect.

And if, descending from the general course of thought to particulars, we ask, Where are all the data to which ch. xv. specifically

alludes?—we reach the same result. Take vs. 3: “Already ye are clean because of (δικά with acc.) the word which I spoke (or have spoken) unto you.” What word? The general understanding, even of the best commentators, is: the gospel, the gospel message in general. But the only reason we fail to see the true reference is that xv. 3 is now so remote from xiii. 10: “He that is bathed needeth not to wash but is clean every whit: *and ye are clean*, but not all.” If it had not been for the “washing” here spoken of, there would be no pertinence in introducing the notion of “*cleanness*” into the parable of the vine. We should have had: “Already ye *live* because of my teaching; abide in me, as the branches in the vine.” The *washing* of ch. xiii. is associated with the doctrine of the growing *vine*, as *baptism* with the sacramental *cup*. Only thus can we explain the sudden mixture of metaphors.

Take, again, the references in xv. 15, 20. Where has Jesus been speaking of the disciples as “bond-servants,” and of himself as “Master” and “Lord”? When did he utter the “word” he bids them “remember” in vs. 20? To both questions we must reply: In ch. xiii., “when he had washed their feet . . . and sat down again.” The references are obvious when compared; but who perceives them after xiii. 31–xiv. 31 have intervened? In short, ch. xv. is intelligible after xiii. 1–20, and is, to say the least, very much less so after xiv. 31. But we have not scrutinized as yet that section of the discourse extending from xv. 18 to xvi. 4, and shall discover that here we have an important objection to meet as well as important corroborations of our theory.

With vs. 18 the subject changes from the inward unity, life and fruitfulness of the church, conditioned on the solidarity of mutual ministering love, to the outward opposition it will encounter from the world—hatred, persecution, martyrdom—in which special help will be sent from the Father by the gift of the Spirit. With xvi. 5 we pass on to the immediate calamity that is to befall the church in the Master’s own martyrdom. Subjoining in turn to this the peroration (xiii. 31^b ff.) and the chapter of farewell, with the succeeding farewell prayer (xiii. 36–xiv. 31, xvii.), we obtain a single discourse, steady, logical, progressive in its course of thought and substantially in harmony with the Synoptic tradition.

For, widely as this differs from the Johannine, certain salient points of coincidence are often discernible, as in the case above cited of xvi. 32 f., xiii. 31–38, compared with Mt. xxvi. 31–35. We have, in fact, in Mt. x. 16–42 and its parallels (Lk. xii. 3–12, and portions of

the apocalyptic chapter, Mt. xxiv. = Mk. xiii. = Lk. xxi.) considerable fragments of a discourse on the future of the church in its conflict with the world, in which the distinguishing feature is the prediction of martyrdom before governors, councils and kings, with the promise of the Holy Spirit as an advocate to plead their cause, so that they need take no thought what answer to make. The discourse is wholly unrelated to the instructions to the disciples for their Galilean tour (Mt. x. 1-15); for this guarantees a cordial reception (cf. Lk. xxii. 35 ff.), and "governors and kings" are not to be met in Galilean villages. It were better placed where fragments of it are found in Lk. xxi., mingled with the apocalypse, or perhaps best of all in the context of Lk. xxii. 35 ff. But place the discourse Mt. x. 16-42 alongside of John xv. 18-xvi. 4, and their substantial equivalence is unmistakable. The coincidence is not merely of meaning, but frequently extends even to verbal identity. Here we need call attention only to John xv. 18-25 = Mt. x. 16, 21 f.; John xv. 20 = Mt. x. 24 f.; John xv. 26 f. = Mt. x. 19 f. (cf. Lk. xii. 11 f.); John xvi. 2 f. = Mt. x. 17, 21-23^a, 28.

But this identification has important bearings upon the question of the original form and order of John xiii.-xvii.: and First, in corroboration of the connected logical sequence we have traced in John xv. f. We perceive now that the subject throughout xv. 18-xvi. 4 is the conflict of the church against the world. This follows naturally upon the subject of the internal unity and life of the church (xiii. 1-20, xv. 1-17), and in turn passes naturally over into that of the personal loss of the disciples and their consolation (xvi. 5-33, xiii. 31-xiv. 31). This is in accord with our natural feeling and practice in putting first outward and general relations, afterwards those most intimate and personal. It verifies our conception of the structure of chaps. xv. f.

Secondly, we note that, while there are several close coincidences of thought and language between the discourse of John xv. f., and Mt. x. 16-42, the closest parallel of all is that of Mt. x. 40: "He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me," which we find *verbatim*, not in John xv. f., but at the very point where we suppose the separation to have been made, viz., John xiii. 20. The only difference is that here, instead of "you," we have "whomsoever I send," an abbreviation of Mt. x. 41, 42. Moreover, the passage, John xv. 15, which next to this one shows the closest verbal correspondence with Mt. x., is also found in John xiii. 16, and is repeated in xv. 20. In other words, to

obtain the complete Johannine counterpart of the discourse of Mt. x. 16-42, we must group together John xiii. 12-20 and chaps. xv., xvi.

But, thirdly, our comparison with Mt. x. 16 ff. will go beyond a mere corroboration of the restored order, and will help us to an understanding of the process through which the present disorder has arisen. It furnishes an answer to the question which unavoidably presents itself to the reader of John xiv.: Whence, all at once, this term "Paraclete" applied to the Holy Spirit? If the promise of the Holy Spirit as made by Jesus was primarily that of the Synoptics (Mt. x. 20; Lk. xii. 11 f.), then no term could be more appropriate to designate him who should teach them what to say when summoned before persecuting tribunals, than Paraclete, *i.e.* Advocate; whence the perfect suitableness of the term in the Fourth Gospel, if xv. 26 f. were the *first* mention. That further ministrations should be assigned to the same "Spirit of Truth" in the subsequent mention (xvi. 7-15), is but natural; but the special designation can only be understood if the promise is made *primarily* as in the Synoptics and John xv. 26. It is not intelligible in xiv. 16 if this come first, especially when accompanied by the distinguishing *ἄλλον*, "*another*." We have yet to hear of the original. So far, then the correspondence is one more argument for an earlier place for John xv. But can John xiv. 15-17 stand in a context subsequent to John xv. 26 f.? This depends upon the interpretation we give the qualifying adjective "*another*." If we adopt that which seems to be suggested by the context: "a second intercessor besides myself, my promise to plead for you being already given" (vv. 13, 14), the author approaches very near the view of the writer of 1 John ii. 1, for whom the Intercessor or Paraclete is Jesus himself. But this can scarcely be said of the author of John xv. 26 ff., whose Paraclete is identical with the Advocate of the Synoptics, a Helper before earthly tribunals. Moreover, the connection of xiv. 15-17 with the surrounding context is thus seen to be of the very loosest, and the verses themselves both superfluous and objectionable. The comfort offered the bereaved Eleven is, that Jesus will come again to dwell with them in a spiritual parousia, a "manifestation unto them and not unto the world," in contrast with the cruder earlier expectations. The gift of the interceding Spirit (vv. 15-17), introduced in the midst of this, not only anticipates very awkwardly the promise of xv. 26 ff., but is confusing to such an extent that, notoriously, the reader cannot tell whether the Second or Third Person of the Trinity is spoken of. For those who

can find an interpretation of "another Paraclete," which, on the one hand, maintains this necessary distinction (vs. 17), and, on the other, does not presuppose xv. 26 ff., it might be possible to maintain the originality of vv. 15-17, and even the present order of the chapters, supposing other objections removed. Until this adequate interpretation is forthcoming, the verses must stand as a witness that the transposition of the chapters was not accidental, or was at least the occasion of editorial revision. For, unless we assume gratuitous interpolation, suggested by the mere resemblance of the functions of the Spirit to those assumed by Jesus in vv. 13, 14, it must appear to have been inserted to take the place of the promise of xv. 26 ff. and the Synoptics, referred to in xiv. 25 f. If the apparently implied application of the title "Paraclete" to Jesus himself be really present, we have even an important link connecting this editorial hand with the writer of the First Epistle.

We are thus brought to the second and by far the most important part of our investigation. If the transposition has been made, what of it? The answer cannot be the short and easy one of "Accident," until, at least, we have scrutinized the whole Gospel to see whether it does not really furnish, as maintained by Wendt, repeated examples of an interruption of context subsequently resumed; so that the ordinary explanation—the Fourth Evangelist, a subjective writer, careless of the historical unities—becomes inadequate. The difference between the work of such a writer and that of the compiler, manipulator or editor of existing oral and written material, is of course in the *resumption*. The subjective writer departs from the conditions assumed as well as the editor; but the unities are reëstablished by the latter whenever and wherever he inserts the piece that should properly follow.

Without feeling called upon to accept the theory of Wendt as a whole, we may readily and gladly recognize the evidence supplied in his valuable work (*Lehre Jesu*, Göttingen, 1886, I. Theil, pp. 215-311), that the discourses which form the substance of the Fourth Gospel are in reality in the nature of *material* which has been subjected to an unusually intimate process of editorial manipulation to adjust it to an ill-fitting frame. To this evidence our own discussion offers simply a supplement or contribution. The instances to be given are partly from Wendt, partly new. The first is as characteristic as any, and is found in the misfit of vv. 6-8, 15 in the Prologue. Thus vs. 14 reads: "The Word dwelt among us . . . *full of grace and truth.*"

Verse 16 follows: "For of his *fulness* we all received, and *grace* for *grace*; for . . . *grace* and *truth* came by Jesus Christ." I am convinced that in any other document than the Fourth Gospel, concerning whose unity, like the seamless coat, the saying of Baur has become an idol, the intervention here of vs. 15: "John beareth witness," etc., would be called the mutilation of an editor or interpolator.

In like manner a scrutiny of vii. 15-24 will reveal the fact that it properly belongs in the connection of ch. v., probably after vs. 47. In any event, it is part of the argument concerning the law of Moses, precipitated, according to v. 1 ff., by Jesus' healing of the man at the pool of Bethesda on the Sabbath. Verse 18 resumes the thought of v. 44; vs. 19 refers to the attempt to kill him of v. 18; vv. 21 and 23^b refer to the healing, v. 8 f.; vv. 22, 23 justify the healing on the Sabbath by the law of Moses regarding circumcision. The separation, therefore, of vii. 15-24 from the discourse of ch. v., by an indefinite period of time, during which Jesus visits the Decapolis, performs the miracle of the loaves, teaches in Capernaum, and again goes up to Jerusalem at the feast of tabernacles, is simply impossible. The passage is decidedly more obviously displaced than chaps. xv. f.

Again, at vs. 37 of the same chapter we ask: Is not this "last day of the feast" a later one than "the midst of the feast" (vs. 14)? Why, then, do the officers of vs. 32 not report until vs. 45? What room for vv. 37-44 between? And why is Jesus, in viii. 12-20, on a seemingly different occasion (cf. vs. 20, though the occasion is given in the loosest and vaguest way possible), still engaged with the same discussion, on the same subject, with apparently the same interlocutors, as in both ch. v. and chaps. vi. and vii.? Cf. vv. 13, 17 ff. with v. 31 ff.; vs. 14 with vi. 41 ff., vii. 27 ff.; vs. 15 f. with v. 22-30 and vii. 24.

Still a different occasion is intended by the editor in viii. 21-59, although we have again the bare formula, as in vs. 12, "Again he said unto them," reminding us of the phrases which introduce the *λόγια*. Nevertheless, the situation is the same (vs. 59), the circumstances the same (vv. 37, 40, 44), the subject the same (whence the Christ is, vv. 23, 29, 38 ff.; whither he goes, vs. 21 f., cf. vii. 33-36; he seeks not his own glory but God's, vs. 49 f., 54, cf. v. 44, vii. 18), the interlocutors the same (unbelieving Jews and Pharisees; the exception in vs. 31 is erroneously made, — vv. 22 ff., 37, 40 ff., 44, 55, etc.).

The *logion* (ix. 39-41) is introduced under circumstances which make the presence of the Pharisees well-nigh incredible. And yet here they are, inviting more of the same kind of rebuke as in viii. 12-19. We might almost suppose the dialogue uninterrupted.

In ch. x. the fact that vv. 24 ff. are separated from the parables of the sheep in vv. 1-18 by narrative material which seems to indicate a disparity of months in time and a wholly different occasion, does not prevent Jesus from quietly continuing to speak about "my sheep" (vv. 26 ff.), and assuming that his interlocutors are the same he has previously debated with (vv. 25, 32).

But perhaps the most remarkable of these cases where the setting ignores the discourse, and *vice versa*, is in ch. xii. It is quite surprising, in view of the great privacy observed in vv. 20-23, which seems to be maintained down to vs. 28, that suddenly in vs. 29 the ubiquitous multitude are at hand, witnesses not merely of the **בֵּית קוֹל** (vs. 28), but even of the answer given in utmost privacy to Philip and Andrew (cf. vs. 34 with vs. 23; but see below). But it is still more surprising, when, after being told that "Jesus departed and hid himself from them," and after the editor has moralized on the reason for the small effect of Jesus' preaching (vv. 36^b-43), of a sudden, Jesus (in vs. 44) continues what he was saying about "the light," "believing on the light," "walking in the darkness," etc., all apparently as "a voice crying in the wilderness," entirely without hearers!

In view of phenomena such as these, not to speak of a multitude of incongruities and incompatibilities of conception between various elements of the Gospel, one may well be disposed to require and look for some comprehensive explanation, even while withholding assent from that proposed by the able scholar whose work we have quoted. As a preliminary result may we not set it down as a proposition worthy at least of serious consideration: That the discourses of the Fourth Gospel were not composed for their present setting; but rather, like the *λόγια* in the form given them in our Mt. and Lk., were given such a historical setting as the tradition or conjecture of the post-apostolic generation was able to frame? The Gospel itself gives more than a hint of composite origin (xix. 35, xxi. 24), including both oral and written "Johannine" material (xxi. 24). May we not also hope, as the *disiecta membra*—if such they prove to be—of these marvellous discourses are brought into more logical sequence and unity, and placed side by side with the Synoptic tradition which they appear to paraphrase in a deeper, more esoteric sense, that thereby their true intent and origin may be found easier of determination, and the relation of the discourses and the narrative within the Gospel, as well as the relation of both to the Synoptic tradition, may be the better understood? It is in this hope that the present study is submitted.